

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

G. HERBERT & Co. Proprietors

VOLUME XX. NO. 32.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1855.

{WHOLE NO. 1172

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER,

A Religious and Literary Paper.

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2 00 per annum, payable in all cases in advance.

All letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. James, or "Editor of the Biblical Recorder."

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post paid.

For further particulars see last page.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all cash charges are paid.

3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible until they have settled their bill, and order their paper discontinued.

4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or personal from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

The Comparative Influence.

Baptist and Pedobaptist Principles in the Christian Nature of Children, by Rev. F. Wilson Editor of The True Union.

The Christian nature of children.—What subject can be more important or interesting to parents, to teachers, and to the whole community? Children are the hope of the world.

Around them cluster the tenderest affections, the warmest desires, the brightest anticipations; while, by their comparative innocence, their confiding trustfulness, their susceptibility to good and evil impressions, and the momentous consequences which must result from their early training, they plead for such a nurture as will best secure their earthly happiness and their immortal bliss.

The claims of society, and the promptings of affection, unite with the divine command to make it a sacred duty to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

That religious system, therefore, which presents the strongest motives, and the most effectual means for discharging this duty, must necessarily offer the greatest attractions to parents and teachers.

This honor has been earnestly claimed for the doctrine which introduces infants to baptism and membership in Christ's church. It has laid its firmest foundations in this appeal to parental love.

Poetry has invested the hallowed scene of infant dedication with the sweetest fascinations. Eloquence has lent its charms to increase the beauty of the rite, and to cast odium upon those who have been falsely charged with forbidding children to come to Christ by forbidding their baptism.

Says one writer: "The baptism of children, sealing their covenant relation to God, as members of his visible church, is a most sacred rite, which all Christian parents should gratefully appreciate; not merely as a religious ceremony, but as a most precious privilege, and one fraught, if duly improved, with blessings as imperishable as the soul, and as lasting as eternity."

Dr. Payson has a sermon on the "Children of the Covenant, the Saviour's first care;" and Dr. Rushnell speaks of Christ as, in baptism, "bringing children tenderly into his fold;" and then asks, "Is it worthy of your tenderness, as a Christian parent, to leave them outside of the fold when the gate is open, only taking care to go in yourself?" These and similar sentiments are constantly echoed by Pedobaptist preachers.

Baptists, on the contrary, are stigmatized as "leaving children unrecognized and unprovided for," abandoning them to "the unenvied mercies of God;" or as "telling the church that after she has given existence, and the egg of immortality is produced, her motherly duty is to copy the instinct of the Nubian Ostrich, and leave it hidden in the sand;" a libel, of which its author, Dr. Bushnell, ought to be ashamed. Were this true, we should not complain of the prejudice which it kindles against us; nor could we blame the multitude who reject with horror a system which so rudely consigned their children to neglect and ruin.

A doctrine cannot be scriptural which brings forth such evil fruits. But false and unjust as it is, we cannot remain silent. We believe that this dangerous weapon can be wrested from the hands of our opponents, and employed against their own principles; and it will be our present design to show that Baptist principles appeal more strongly to the Christian heart, and offer to the child more powerful motives to win him early to Christ, than those of Pedobaptists.

1. It will be necessary first to state distinctly the difference between the two opposing theories, as we have been grossly misrepresented by men whose piety and learning ought to have saved them from "bearing false witness." Dr. Bushnell says: "The Baptist tells the child that nothing but sin can be expected of him;" "presumes that he will not grow up a believer;" that he is to "grow up in sin, to be converted when he comes to the age of maturity;" and he intimates that ours is "a type of religion which approaches strict individualism, which practically hangs all power and progress on adult conversions."

This is altogether a mistake. The Baptists limit the work of the Holy Spirit to no age.—They believe that all who die in infancy are regenerated by grace, and saved through Christ, and that those who live may, in the very dawn of their moral being, yield their tender hearts to Jesus. Numerous instances of this character are found in Baptist families; and as a minister once said, when baptizing one of these children of Christ, "there is a kind of infant baptism we practise, the baptism of infant believers."

But we dare not "presume" either that a child is or will be a Christian, without evidence; and therefore, we dare not apply to him a rite "by which," as the Methodist Discipline teaches, "Christians are distinguished from others who are not baptized."

The difference is simply this: The Baptists regard a mere heart as an essential prerequisite to baptism and church membership; the Pedobaptists admit infants to both without any such change of heart. The Baptists maintain that

regeneration by the Holy Spirit alone can fit any human being for a place in God's kingdom on earth or in heaven.

Without this, outward forms are a useless mockery; with it, a delightful privilege. They require first the conversion of the heart to God; after that, obedience to external ordinances. Wherever good evidences of such conversion appear, whether in the little child or the grey-haired sinner, they gladly administer baptism, but not until then.

The Pedobaptist theory is the reverse of this. Whatever variations there may be among them they all agree that the children of believers are either "born members of the church," or are "made members by baptism," without faith, without conversion, without any evidence of regeneration.

With us, personal character is the only good title to baptism and church-membership; with them, the accident of their birth in the flesh is the title. With us, living piety, real consecration of their hearts to God, is the first thing we seek for our children; with them, baptism, a dead form, is an outward consecration of the body, is the first thing.

II. We will proceed now to exhibit the practical tendency of their opposite theories. And first, we remark that the Pedobaptist has no advantage over the Baptist, in training his children.

Notwithstanding all the boasted privileges of the baptized child, of which we hear so much, they vanish into air on examination. We argue not now with those who believe that a few drops of water on the forehead of an unconscious babe, regenerates its soul, and who, very consistently, like the Banner of the new birth, as an experience to be known by certain signs and impressions," and style it "a perfectly shocking system of delusions!" Most Protestants agree with us in rejecting this absurd notion of the Papists and Puseyites, which makes baptism "a rite of christian magic." But if it does not regenerate the child, of what advantage is it?

Both parties must admit, that so far as human instrumentality is concerned, the character of the child must depend entirely upon its training, including in this not only instruction, but parental example and guidance. The beauty of holiness exhibited in the daily life of the family, is the most efficient teacher. Much also depends upon the religious doctrines instilled into the mind in the tender hours of childhood. They will never be forgotten, but will spring up in after years, either as the tree of life, shedding health and fragrance upon the soul, or as the poisonous opus, distilling death. Truth only can benefit the child, but error will inflict irreparable injury.

Now, the great doctrines of the Bible held by evangelical Pedobaptists, are the same with those of the Baptists; and, if their respective systems interpose no barrier to the purity, faithfulness with which those doctrines are taught, then it is plain that they are at least equal in this respect. There is nothing in the Baptist theory to prevent the pious mother from teaching her little ones the touching stories of the Bible, the wondrous drama of the Cross—nothing to keep her from leading them to bow the knee in prayer, and lip the sweet name of Jesus, to go to the Sabbath School and house of God, and, in every way, to receive the best religious instruction. There is nothing in it to prevent, but everything (as we shall see presently) to encourage parents and teachers by kind words, holy tempers, and affectionate, gentle manners, to win the children into the path of peace. What single means of religious training is the Baptist deprived of, which any other man possesses? We cannot even imagine one.

Where now are the vaunted privileges of the "baptized children?" In the words of Noel—"In no respect do they differ from the unbaptized, except that the first bear a name which, by itself, is delusive and worse than worthless!" Calling children "Christians," will not make them so; introducing them into the church on earth, will not insure them entrance into heaven. If it did, we could not hasten too eagerly to affix the wonder-working "seal of the covenant," which would open the celestial gates for our dear offspring; but heaven is not so cheaply obtained.

Having thus shown that the Pedobaptist has no advantage over the Baptist, we now advance a step and remark that the reverse is true; that the Baptist principles have decided advantages over those of their opponents. The religious education of a child depends principally upon two things—the peculiar doctrines taught, and the tenderness, earnestness, and prayerful spirit with which they are taught. That system is undeniably the best which presents divine truth in its purest form, to the young mind, and which tends to kindle in the parent's heart the most intense anxiety for the conversion of his children. In both these respects, we believe the Baptist theory superior to the other.

In the instruction given to the child, all evangelical Christians agree in the following great truths. That man is a lost sinner; that "Christ crucified" is his only Saviour. That to be saved, he "must be born again" by the Holy Ghost; he must believe in Jesus, and consent to be saved by grace alone, and not by works. These are the simple yet grand doctrines which must be felt and embraced with the heart by the little child, as well as by the adult, ere it can rejoice in the Redeemer's love. The loveliest children who have ever gladdened the earth with the sweet blossoms and rich fruit of their youthful piety, have been such as most deeply felt their sinfulness, and their need of a Saviour.

The great point, then, to be aimed at, in the religious instruction of children, is to bring them in penitence and contrition to the Cross, the blood of the Lamb may be applied by faith to wash away the pollution and guilt of sin.—They must be taught that they are sinners, that they are lost, and that no human efforts—nothing but the atonement of Jesus Christ—can save them.

Now, we are far from intimating that many pious Pedobaptists do not thus teach their children. They undoubtedly hold these views, and in most cases, we trust, inculcate them. But we do maintain that the tendency of infant baptism is to break the force of these solemn truths upon the child's heart, to lead it to regard its condition with complacency, and thus to retard or prevent its early conversion.

The human heart is full of pride and self-righteousness. It hates the humiliating require-

ments of the gospel, and snatches at every frail straw within its reach, before it will seek safety in the ark opened by Divine grace. One such crumbling straw is placed by the Pedobaptist theory in the hands of every baptized child. An opiate is administered by this ceremony to lull to sleep the awakened conscience, and to make it feel that its condition is not, after all, so very dangerous—that it is not altogether lost, but in a much safer state than the unbaptized.

This is no vain assertion. It is proved by the Catechisms and Confessions of Faith used in the instruction of those children, and by many lamentable facts.

In the catechism of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the second answer which the child is taught to repeat, contains the words: "baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven!" If any child believes this absurd statement, it cannot possibly feel its need of faith in Christ. It is safe already, and cannot ask "what shall I do to be saved?" It is effectually shielded against the arrows of conviction, and made to cry "peace, peace, when there is no peace."

In the Heidelberg Catechism, (of the Reformed Dutch Church,) the child is taught thus.—Ques. 74: "Are infants also to be baptized?" Ans. "Yes. For since they, as well as the adult, are included in the covenant and Church of God, and since redemption from sin by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, the author of faith, is promised to them, no less than to the adult; they must, therefore, by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also admitted into the Christian Church, and be distinguished from the children of Infidels, &c."

In the same catechism, (Ques. 54,) the child is taught to say—"that the Son of God from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends and preserves unto himself by his Spirit and word, out of the whole human race, a church chosen to everlasting life, agreeing in true faith; and that I am, and ever shall remain a living member thereof!"

It would require an understanding much more acute than that of a child, to see how an individual, already "a living member of the church of God, chosen to everlasting life," can need repentance or faith, or any other spiritual change, to make its prospects for heaven more secure. How could that child dream of fleeing from "the wrath to come," or feel any concern whatever about its salvation? Could there be a more effectual means devised, than such instruction, to make it feel perfectly satisfied with its condition, although truly "without hope, and without God in the world?"

The Augsburg Confession (of the Lutheran church) teaches, that baptism ought to be administered to children, who are thereby dedicated to God, and received into his favor."—[Art. IX.]

Concluded next issue.

From the Chronicle and Sentinel.

Religious Liberty—Lord Baltimore.

To the Hon. A. H. Stephens:

Dear Sir: In a speech recently made by you in the city of Augusta, I perceive that you refer to Lord Baltimore, the Catholic founder of Maryland, as having been the first to establish a government on the principle of religious freedom, on this continent.

I beg leave respectfully to join issue with you on this statement, and that for two reasons: First, because it gives credit to one who does not deserve it. Second, because it takes away that credit from one who does deserve it. Lord Baltimore was not the first to found a government, but he never founded such an one at all, nor did any of his successors who inherited his titles. The pioneer in the cause of religious liberty, was not a Catholic, but a Baptist; not Lord Baltimore, but Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island.

Whatever might have been the intentions of Lord Baltimore or the favorable disposition of the King, there was no guarantee in the charter, nor indeed the least hint of any toleration in religion, not authorized by the law of England.—Hildreth's U. S., vol. 1, p. 208. Nor was the earliest legislation of Maryland at all more creditable. The "vaunted clause" for liberty, extended only to professed Christians, and was introduced by the proviso, "that whatsoever person shall blaspheme God or shall deny or reproach the Holy Trinity, or any of the three persons thereof, shall be punished with death."—Baneroff's U. S., vol. 1, p. 256. From this we perceive that Jews, now a numerous and respectable portion of our population, and Unitarians, who constitute perhaps the controlling element in New England Society, to say nothing of our Chinese citizens, of whom there are now some thousands, were all liable under this boasted free government, to the penalty of the axe or of the halter.—Says the historian first quoted: "The first four sections of this celebrated act (the so-called Toleration Act) exhibit but little of a tolerant spirit. Death, with forfeiture of land and goods, is denounced against all who shall deny our Saviour or shall deny the Trinity. Fine, whipping and banishment, for the third offence are denounced against all who shall utter any reproachful words or speeches concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, or the Holy Apostle or Evangelists."—Hildreth, vol. 1, p. 347. This is contained in an act "derived in substance if not in every word from Lord Baltimore's drafts," ditto supra. This act "did indeed, but carry out a policy co-eval with the settlement of the colony."—Hildreth, vol. 1, p. 348, and was confirmed by the oath administered to the first governor, which provided for the religious protection of none but those who believed in Jesus Christ.—Baneroff, vol. 1, p. 247. This was in 1649. A few years later, their legislation was even more intolerant; in 1663 those who refused to have their children baptized, were subjected to a fine of 2000 pounds of tobacco.—Hildreth, vol. 1, p. 519. And even as late as 1714 persons expressing certain religious opinions, were liable to have their tongues bored through, and be fined £20.—Hildreth, vol. 11, p. 324. True, the examples last quoted are matters with which the Lord Baltimore had nothing to do, for he died very early in the history of the country; but they serve to illustrate the spirit of Maryland

institutions and are not incompatible with the original charter.

It is worthy of remark furthermore, that whatever of right or wrong there may be in the charter or legislation of Maryland, Catholics in such are to be neither applauded nor censured for the same, for a vast majority of the population were Protestants (Baneroff, II. 454, and Hill. I. 565), and their charter was granted for a Protestant crown. The Catholics had the best of all possible reasons for being in favor of toleration, for in Maryland or in England, they were alike liable to persecution from the dominant party. Indeed, they were once or twice disfranchised on the very soil whither they had fled to escape disfranchisement.

There is no reason to suppose that the full conception of "soul liberty" had ever occurred to the mind of either the first Lord Baltimore or any of his five successors. "It was not toleration but supremacy, for which Catholics and Puritans alike sought, while the Church of England for the maintenance of her own supremacy, struggled equally against both."—Hild. I. 104. "Policy, it is evident had a much larger share in the enactment of this act, (the Toleration Act), than any enlightened view of the rights of opinion, of which, indeed, it evinces but a very limited and confused idea. Now, that the Puritans were triumphant in New England, an exclusive Catholic colony would not have been tolerated for a moment.—The sole chance of securing to Catholics the quiet enjoyment of their faith, consisted in bestowing a like liberty on the Protestants—a policy indeed upon which Lord Baltimore had found it necessary to act from the very first planting of the colony.—Hild. I. 348. The italics are not those of the historian.

Such, my dear sir, is the testimony of history, with regard to the much boasted freedom of the government instituted by the Catholic founder of Maryland. I know that historians, and even those from whom I have quoted, catching the popular breath, sometimes speak of him "as the first to establish religious liberty;" but these very historians modify these expressions, and indeed correct them, by narrating the facts above set forth—facts which invalidate his claims and those of all his successors. Whatever laudations may be indulged in by those disposed to favor Lord Baltimore, their own evidence when sifted, will show that there is but little harmony between their applause, and the facts to which they testify.

The following account of Roger Williams on the other hand, will show that he understood the theory of religious liberty, in all its plenitude and glory, as well as that early period as the most enlightened of the present day. He protested that "magistrates are but the agents of the people, or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred;" "that their power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men.—Ban. I. 371. "In the capacious recesses of his mind, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and he and he alone, had arrived at the great principle, which is its sole effectual remedy. He announced his discovery under the simple proposition of sanctity of conscience. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion, should punish guilt, but never violate the freedom of the soul. The doctrine contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence; it would blot from the statute book the felony of non-conformity; would quench the fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal protection to every form of religious faith; would never suffer the authority of the civil government to be enlisted against the mosque of the Mussulman, or the altar of the fire-worshipper, against the Jewish Synagogue or the Roman Cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of these views, Roger Williams never changed his position; the sanctity of conscience was the great tenet which with all its consequences he defended as he first trod the shores of New England, and in his extreme old age it was the last pulsation of his heart."—Baneroff, I. 367-8.

"He was the first person in modern Christendom, to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of freedom of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law; and in its defence, he was the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and superior of Jeremy Taylor."—Baneroff, I. 376. The voice of Williams in favor of liberty was heard in New England in 1631; which was before Lord Baltimore's patent was granted; when Milton was but 28 years of age, and Taylor but 18. Williams' great idea of what he called "soul liberty" was at that time, says Hildreth, "wholly novel," vol. I, p. 223. Novel indeed it may have been, outside of the little Baptist world, but there were many of that faith and order besides Williams, who were imbued with the spirit of liberty. Indeed, it was not Williams who produced the Baptists; the Baptists produced him. They were not the exponent of his views, but he of theirs.—Said the people of Rhode Island, in their instructions to him, when he went to England to apply to Charles II. for a charter, "plead our case in such sort as we may not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences; we do not judge it no less than a point of absolute necessity." These instructions are printed in Mass. Hist., Coll. xvii. 85. "The document," says Baneroff, "is of the highest interest; no learning nor skill in rhetoric could have mended it." I. 61. "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first the trophy of the Baptists"—ditto II. 66. "They applied the doctrine of the Reformation to the social relations of life and threatened an end to King-craft, spiritual dominion, tithes and vassalage. The party was trodden under foot with reproaches and most arrogant scorn; and its history is written in the blood of myriads of the German peasantry; but its principles, safe in their immortality, escaped with Roger Williams to Providence; and his colony is the witness that naturally the paths of the Baptists were paths of freedom, pleasantness and peace."—Ban. II. 459. "In the government of Rhode Island, 'Freedom of faith and worship was assured to all,—the first formal and legal establishment of religious liberty ever promulgated, whether in America or Europe."—Hildreth I. 333. The following is a

quotation from the charter itself: "No person within said colony shall be molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any difference of opinion in matters of religion, who does not actually disturb the civil peace; but that all and every person and persons may at all times freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgements and consciences, in matters of religious concerns, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury and outward disturbance of others." "The charter did not limit freedom to Christian sects alone; it granted equal rights to the paynim and the worshipper of Fo."—Ban. II. 63.

In discussing this question, many seem to take it for granted that the government, both of Maryland and Rhode Island, were really free, and that the point to be decided, relates only to priority of time. This is not the true issue. It is not a question of time, (as between these two claimants) but a question of fact. I have shown that the government of Lord Baltimore was not free, and that of Williams was.

Allow me, Mr. Stephens, to say in conclusion, that if the casual allusion referred to, you have erred, I believe you have not done so intentionally. I know enough of your character to feel sure that you would in no case wilfully misrepresent, and that if you have inadvertently done so, no one will be more ready to rectify the matter than yourself. Your speech will probably be read by tens of thousands, and the wrong impression made by your remark must be very general. People confiding in your habitual accuracy; will be the more disposed to rely on your statements, and will thus be more easily misled. Nor is it a trifling matter.—There are in the State of Georgia some seventy or eighty thousand Baptists, actual communicants, to say nothing of their friends and adherents, all of whom are, more or less interested in the point at issue. I know that you do not wish to do the denomination injustice, by denying its lawful claims to honorable distinction, and to the gratitude of the world. I confidently believe, therefore, that you will second the effort that I have made, so to place this matter before the public, as that all may be able to "give honor to whom honor is due."

I will say no further, that I express neither approval nor disapproval of any sentiment or statement in your speech other than the one above discussed. Being a Minister of the Gospel, I deem it incompatible with my profession to take any active part in politics, and hereby utterly disclaim any public connection with the same, in any way whatever. The point in question being purely historical, and one of great interest to the denomination of Christians to which I belong, comes quite legitimately within my sphere.

With great respect, I am, sir, Your obedient servant,

H. H. TUCKER.

LaGrange, Ga., June 14th, 1855.

Lord Baltimore—Roger Williams.

CRAWFORDVILLE, Ga., June 25th, '55.

To Rev. H. H. Tucker, LaGrange.

DEAR SIR: I have seen your letter addressed to me in the Chronicle and Sentinel of the 22d inst., which seems to look for an answer, and in sending it I shall resort to the same medium of communication adopted by yourself. The issue you join with me about Lord Baltimore amounts to nothing. What I said in my speech in Augusta is strictly true, as I understand the history of the country. The Catholic colony of Maryland, organized under the auspices of Lord Baltimore, was the first "to establish the principle of free toleration in religious worship" on this continent. What you say of Roger Williams is equally true. He was the first champion of the principle. He proclaimed the principle as early as 1631—perhaps earlier; and for his own religious opinions was driven from Massachusetts in '65 or '66. He may be considered the founder of the colony of Rhode Island, which contained in its charter granted some years after a guaranty that "none were to be molested for any difference of opinion in religious matters." But the colony of Maryland, where this principle was established and protection afforded to all persecuted sects elsewhere, was founded in 1634, before Williams left Massachusetts. Williams is entitled to the honor of being the first to advocate and proclaim the principle as an individual. For this I have repeatedly given him full credit in my speeches. But the colony was the first to establish and give practical effect to the principle in her civil polity. In making this statement, it was not my purpose to do the least injustice to Williams, whose name should be held in sacred remembrance, nor was it my purpose thereby to become the "defender of Romanism;" as some (not you sir,) are pleased to stile me, but to defend that same principle which Roger Williams deserves so much honor for being the first to proclaim—that "soul Liberty," as he called it, which he was the first great apostle of in modern times, which now lies at the foundation of our happy institutions, and which the Catholic on this continent, so far from being opposed to, (as far as I have knowledge touching their views,) were the first to adopt. My object was not to defend or assail any sect or any faith, but to defend in its purity real Americanism against bogus Americanism.

Yours most respectfully,

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS.

Lord Baltimore Again.

Hon. A. H. Stephens:

DEAR SIR: You were right in supposing that my former communication, controverting your statement in reference to Lord Baltimore, "looked for an answer." I did look for an answer—I still look for one. You tell me that the issue between us "amounts to nothing." What it "amounts to," is just this: Did Lord Baltimore establish religious toleration on this continent? You affirm that he did, and that he was the first to do it. I deny that he ever did it at all. Whether this issue "amounts to nothing," an intelligent public will decide, or probably has already decided. The same tribunal will also decide whether this summary way of disposing of an issue argues either ability or willingness to meet it fairly.

In my former letter, assuming the ONES PROBABLY, which properly belonged to you, and not to me, (thus giving you an advantage in

the discussion which you could not claim,) I showed that the colony of Maryland, under Lord Baltimore, did not establish religious freedom. I quoted from the so called "Toleration Act" itself, and showed in the very words of the Act, that death was the penalty of expressing certain religious opinions. How have you met me on this point? Simply by asserting that "the Catholic colony of Maryland under Lord Baltimore, was the first to establish the principle of free toleration in religious worship." What does this "amount to?" Is your assertion to be balanced against the Legislative records of the country? The readers of the "Chronicle and Sentinel" will decide. In order that they may the better estimate the value of the two, I will place them in parallel columns:

A. H. STEPHENS. "Denying the Holy Trinity to be punished under the auspices of with death, and confiscation of land and goods to first to establish the Lord Proprietary (Lord Baltimore himself) the principle of free toleration in religious worship on this continent."

LAW OF MARYLAND. "Blessed Virgin Mary or the Holy Apostles or Evangelists, to be fined 25, or in default of payment to be publicly whipped and imprisoned at the pleasure of his Lordship, [Lord Baltimore himself] or of his Majesty's Council in the Lieutenant General's Court. See Laws of Maryland at Large, by T. Bacon, A. D. 1755. 16 and 17th Clauses of Lord Baltimore.

This act dated 21st April, 1849, when Lord Baltimore was on the zenith of his power, and was copied in substance, if not in very words, from drafts written by his Lordship's own hand. (Hild. I. 847.) Now sir, I know that your ingenuity is truly remarkable, but if you will reconcile the statements in these parallel columns, and thus show that "what you said in Augusta was strictly true," I think you will achieve for yourself a new reputation, which will be to what you already enjoy, as "another morn, risen on midnoon."

But if you fail to reconcile them, you must not think that your reputation for accuracy, on which alone you seem to rely, will sustain you. An intelligent people will take the mere say-so of no man, when it flatly denies such a record as is above adduced.

If religious toleration was "established" in Maryland, it must have been done by law. I call on you to point me to that law. The mere ipse dixit of those who professing to write history, interlard their statements of facts with inferences and notions falsely deduced from them, will not do. The highest evidence that the nature of the case admits of, is the only evidence that the court of public opinion will receive. Nothing but the document which established religious freedom in Maryland under Lord Baltimore, will meet the demand rightfully made upon you.

When a statesman occupying a position as prominent as your own, makes assertions important in their bearings, which are openly controverted, it is but due to himself, (allow me respectfully to suggest,) as well as to his constituents and the public generally, that he should either retract those statements, or prove them to be true. In this case, you have not done the former, nor have you even made an attempt to attempt it. I hope the issue now, "amounts to" something.

I perceive that in your communication to me, you make a mistake of some 80 years in your chronology; but as the error may have been typographical, I gave you the benefit of the doubt—though as the error occurs twice, the probabilities would seem to be against you.

I must repeat what I said in my former letter, that the issue is not one of dates. If you will show that Maryland, under Lord Baltimore, was ever a free government, either before Rhode Island or after, you will meet the issue satisfactorily. You may show the invitation of Lord Baltimore to Puritans and Episcopalians. But this invitation "established" nothing. And even if it did, yet, as the parties invited were both in power—one in New England and the other in Old England—the invitation can avail you nothing, unless you show that it extended also to parties not in power—to Quakers, Baptists, Jews, and in your own language, to "all persecuted sects."

Allow me to say in conclusion, that if I have spoken to you plain things in a plain way, and defied your statements especially, it has not been my intention in so doing to be uncourteous. Nothing could be further from my wish. Your protracted experience at the Bar, has doubtless long since taught you, that parties on opposite sides of a question, do not necessarily lose their respect and esteem for each other. I make these apologetic remarks, therefore, not for your sake, for I know you would not require them; but for the sake of the non-professional reader and those uninitiated in the customs of debate, who might do me the injustice to suppose, that what I intended only for emphasis, is done in forgetfulness of the law of kindness, and of the consideration due to the character and position of my distinguished opponent. I fear no such injustice from you.

As ever, sir, respectfully yours,

H. H. TUCKER.

LaGrange, Ga., July 6, 1855.

VERDICT AGAINST MR. BOOTH.

Mr. Garland of St. Louis, vs. S. M. Booth, of Milwaukee, for the value of the alleged fugitive slave Glover, who escaped from the U. S. District Court at Madison, Judge Miller presiding, during three days last week. The case was given to the jury on Saturday evening, and without leaving their seats they found a verdict for the plaintiff of \$1,000 and costs.

The circumstances of his case are pretty well known. Garland arrested his slave, Glover, at Milwaukee, and brought him before the U. S. Commissioner for the Identification and formal delivery. Booth, the editor of a paper, and an abolitionist of the first water, aided the negro to escape from Milwaukee, and ran by the underground railroad to Canada. For this a suit of damages was brought against him by Garland. The case was tried some time ago but the jury, we believe, did not agree. Now the case is ended, and Mr. Booth is ordered to plank up \$1000 as the price of his indulgence in philanthropy.